

Title: Non-invasive Corrosion Sensor

Application Number: 10/744,649
Response to Office Action mailed 12/15/2004
Navy Case Number 85003**REMARKS**

Claims 2-4, 14, 16 and 17 have been canceled and claims 1 and 5 has been amended to overcome Examiners rejection and objections. Changes were made to the specification to improve readability, maintain consistency throughout the specification, and to correct grammatical errors. None of the changes to the specification are related to the patentability of Applicant's invention.

Section 112 Rejection

Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2-4 are hereby cancelled. Claim 1 no longer includes the language "first side of the peltier" and includes the language from Claim 5. Claim 1 is now Claim 5 without the added element of an "enclosure."

Drawings

Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Examiner stated that the drawings must show every feature specified in the claims. Examiner stated a feature in Claim 1 is not shown in the drawings. Claim 1 has been amended to include language and features shown in the drawings. As stated above Amended Claim 1 includes all the language of Claim 5.

Claim Objections

Examiner objected to Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 because of informalities. Claims 2 and 4 have been cancelled. Examiner stated that in Claims 1 and 5 "devise" should be replaced with

Title: Non-invasive Corrosion Sensor

Application Number: 10/744,649
Response to Office Action mailed 12/15/2004
Navy Case Number 85003

--device--. As seen in Amended Claims 1 and 5 "devise" has been replaced with --device--.

Examiner further stated that in Claims 1 and 5 "there is no limitation stating how the corrosion is detected." Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to include the language "whereby a higher temperature in the test piece than in the reference standard indicates the presence of corrosion," as well as explain the relationship between the data acquisition device and the peltiers. As required by the Examiner, this statement states how corrosion is detected. Support for this amendment is found on page 4, lines 1-5, 16-17 and page 6, lines 11-15 of the specification. In addition, Examiner stated that in Claim 5 --wherein-- should be added after "enclosure," and --are-- should be added after "standard." Claim 5 has been amended to include the required language.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections are requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 1/10/2005Mark O. Glut
Registration #38,161
Department of the Navy
Office of Counsel, NAVAIRSYSCOM
47123 Buse Road, Unit IPT, B2272/S257
Patuxent River, MD 20670-1547
(301) 757-0582